

EXPERIENCE

Question: What have you learned from your experience?

Answer:

THEME

THERE IS A REAL VALUE TO EXPERIENCE IN THE OVAL OFFICE. NO PRIOR EXPERIENCE CAN PREPARE SOMEONE ADEQUATELY. WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN HAVING THE EXPERIENCE OF BEING PRESIDENT IS SHOWING THAT YOU HAVE LEARNED FROM THAT EXPERIENCE. I HAVE. THAT IS WHY I WILL BE A BETTER PRESIDENT OVER THE NEXT FOUR YEARS.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o I have learned a great deal about the Presidency, about our country, about the government, about our role in the world over the past four years. That experience could not have been duplicated elsewhere.
- o I have learned first-hand that no prior experience can adequately prepare someone for the Presidency - certainly not in this ever-demanding government and complex, changing world.
- o The difference between now and 1976 is that I have clearly learned from my experience - learned the importance of extensive consultations with Congress, gotten to know the Congressional leaders and developed friendships with leaders around the world. I have learned to target priorities, the dangers and force of inflation, and the fragility of peace. And I believe I am a better President because of this, and because of the changes I have made.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan would face many of the same problems I did when I took office - a background in State government, a need to put together an entire new Administration, a need to develop an entire new legislative program, a need to get to know well the Members of Congress, a need to meet the world leaders.
- o All of that takes precious time, and all of it means that progress we are already making to solving economic and other problems will be interrupted.
- o And, of course, Governor Reagan will have the added burden of being a Republican, having to deal with a Democratic Congress.

OVERVIEW
COPY
JUN 27 1993

CAMPAIGN PROMISES

Question: Why should the public attach much value in your campaign promises this year, since you appear to have disregarded so many of your 1976 campaign promises?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE A SOUND RECORD IN HONORING MY MAJOR CAMPAIGN PROMISES. I LEARNED FROM MY EXPERIENCE AS PRESIDENT, THOUGH, THAT SOME OF MY '76 COMMITMENTS WERE EITHER NOT REALISTIC OR WERE NOT IN OUR COUNTRY'S BEST INTEREST. THE EXPERIENCE OF BEING PRESIDENT HAS TAUGHT ME WHAT CAN REALISTICALLY BE ACHIEVED OVER THE NEXT FOUR YEARS, AND I HAVE NOT PROMISED MORE THAN THAT. MY OPPONENT CONTINUES TO PROMISE MORE THAN CAN BE ACHIEVED.

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o I was the first President to compile and disclose publicly all my campaign promises; that was done to allow the public to judge my performance against the promises.
- o Any objective assessment of my performance shows that I have honored an extraordinary number of the promises, and done everything possible to honor most of them:
 - Comprehensive energy policy
 - Comprehensive urban policy
 - Appointments -- affirmative action
 - Humphrey-Hawkins
 - Preserving Social Security System
 - Increased education assistance and a Department of Education
 - Supporting human rights
 - Peace between Egypt and Israel
 - Improved relations with China
- o In some cases, Congressional resistance has made impossible the fulfillment of promises during my first term -- National Health Insurance, Welfare Reform, Tax Reform. But I am determined to pursue these matters over the next four years.
- o In some instances, I have departed from my '76 commitments because of the realities I have faced in office and because of the new facts I have learned. For instance, I decided to decontrol oil prices to increase domestic production. I was not able to balance the budget because of the recession. And I have increased defense spending beyond the levels I discussed in '76 campaign due to the poor state of our armed forces and the continued Russian buildup.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

Governor Reagan's energy policy is purely and simply to "turn the oil companies loose", and let them keep virtually all of their windfall profits. He would ignore the need to invest in increased conservation and in alternative energy resources and technologies.

B. Carter

- o I recognized in April of 1977 that doing what was needed in the energy area would not enhance my popularity. I was right.

I was prepared to take the heat for unpopular energy actions, and I will continue to be. But, we now recognize the importance of the steps taken, and that is a vital part of getting the cooperation needed for further progress.

- o Because of the investments that we are making today in energy conservation and in increased production from alternative energy sources, further increases in the price of foreign oil will eventually have a much less serious effect on our Nation's economy.
- o I will continue to provide funding for programs to increase energy conservation and energy production, to ensure that we escape from our dangerous dependence on foreign oil.
- o I want to pass the two remaining pieces of my energy program - The Utility Oil Backout bill to provide incentives for our utilities to produce electricity from American coal rather than foreign oil; and the Energy Mobilization Board, to cut the red-tape out of moving forward with major energy projects while protecting our environmental laws.

ENERGY: STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Question:

You say that you want America to have "energy security," but you have done nothing to fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until the Congress forced you to act. How do you justify this?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE PUT OUR NATION'S FIRST ENERGY PROGRAM IN PLACE. GOVERNOR REAGAN HAS NO REAL ENERGY PROGRAM EXCEPT TURNING THE OIL COMPANIES "LOOSE." I HAVE MOVED TO FILL THE STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE (SPR) AS RAPIDLY AS THE INTERNATIONAL MARKET SITUATION HAS ALLOWED, AND I AM NOW FILLING IT AT A VERY RAPID RATE -- WELL ABOVE THE LEVEL CONGRESS AUTHORIZED. BECAUSE OF OUR POLICIES, WE NOW -- IN THIS COUNTRY -- HAVE A RECORD LEVEL OF OIL RESERVES IN PRIVATE STOCKS.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o When I took office there was no effective Strategic Petroleum Reserve Program (SPR). There had been severe mismanagement and real technical problems with the pumps. I began to store crude oil in the SPR during the fourth quarter of 1977 and had reached a level of 91.2 million barrels at the end of 1979. This slow fill rate was necessary because of the tight international oil supply due to the cut-off of oil from Iran. If we had purchased large quantities of oil for the SPR, we would have contributed to the increase in oil prices and the shortage of oil supply. As a result of our policies, prices have stabilized and private stocks are at all-time highs.
- o We have this month purchased 24 million barrels of oil for delivery this year and early next year. We have also asked for bids on an additional 12.5 million barrels and expect to award those contracts within a week, for delivery early in 1981.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan claims that he would have filled the SPR rapidly all along, as I am now doing. This is typical of the Governor's failure to understand that energy is really a world problem, in which an apparently simple solution for one nation can actually create much larger problems in the world oil markets that will eventually hurt everyone.

B. Carter

- o I will continue to fill the SPR at above the level required by the statute, after careful consideration of the world oil market situation.
- o This policy is responsible and will ensure that we have a secure energy future.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan opposes my programs to provide Federal assistance in order to increase production or decrease consumption: he opposes the Windfall Profits Tax, the Department of Energy, the commitment to Solar, the importance of conservation. Governor Reagan believes that we can solve our energy problems alone, just by "turning the oil companies loose" to find more oil in this country.

B. Carter

- o I will continue to provide substantial Federal assistance for energy conservation and for increased energy production programs. Further decreasing our dependence on foreign oil is the very best way to escape OPEC dominance and demands.
- o I will also continue to strengthen the cooperative structure that I have forged with our allies, so that we can work together to resist any attempts by OPEC to make unreasonable changes in their price or supply conditions.
- o I hope to develop a constructive dialogue with moderate OPEC producers to assure greater certainty of price and supply on world crude oil markets.
- o I want to complete the few remaining pieces of my energy program (Utility Oil Backout bill; Energy Mobilization Board).

ENERGY: ROLE OF HIGHER ENERGY PRICES
IN YOUR ENERGY PROGRAM

Question: Hasn't your energy program caused trouble for you with Democrats because it is essentially the traditional Republican program of inducing greater conservation and production through higher prices?

Answer:

THEME

ENERGY POLICY OPTIONS CANNOT BE SO EASILY PLACED INTO PARTISAN PIGEONHOLES. MY POLICIES HAVE BEEN BASED ON THE NEED TO BALANCE THE ECONOMIC REALITY OF AN INCREASINGLY SCARCE RESOURCE AGAINST THE LEGITIMATE DEMANDS FOR ASSISTANCE OF THOSE WHO ARE BEING HURT BY THE RISING PRICES.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o My energy program has been enacted over these last four years with bipartisan support.
- o I made it clear from my first energy message in 1977 that the price of imported energy was certain to increase. That is a fact of life. To accomplish our goals I have supported the deregulation of energy prices. We cannot have the production and conservation we need with artificial controls on energy. But I have decontrolled on a gradual basis and have gotten the Congress to pass the Windfall Profits Tax to insure that all of the additional profits from decontrol do not go into oil company coffers. That revenue (\$227 billion over ten years) will be used to develop and to conserve more energy here in America, and to help the poor who are most affected by the energy price increases.
- o The only way to combat the increasing energy price tag -- up to \$85 billion sent overseas for foreign oil this year -- is to increase domestic production and to decrease consumption. And my policies have succeeded in both of those goals:
 - More new oil and gas wells this year than ever before.
 - The highest coal production in our Nation's history.
 - Imports of oil down 2 million barrels since I took office.
 - Consuming 8% less gasoline than one year ago.
- o These policies ultimately will assure lower prices than if we continued to be more and more dependent on OPEC.

- o Plants are now being licensed again but under much stricter safety standards.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan simply does not understand the complicated issues presented by nuclear power. For instance, he always speaks in terms of speeding up the licensing process for nuclear power plants rather than emphasizing making sure that they are truly safe.
- o And just this year, Governor Reagan said that "all of the waste in a year from a nuclear power plant could be stored under a desk." That obviously is not true. This cavalier attitude completely ignores the responsibility of the Federal Government to find and to establish a safe nuclear waste disposal program.

B. Carter

- o I am committed to ensuring that nuclear reactors are operated safely. I receive regular reports from the Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee that I established, and I will take any actions that I can to guarantee the American people that their power plants pose no threat to their health or welfare.
- o I am committed to the passage of nuclear waste legislation implementing the comprehensive program that I sent to the Congress last February.
- o I am committed to the rapid development of alternative fuels to ensure that we are not overly dependent on nuclear power. I hope ultimately we can phase-out nuclear power but this cannot be done in the short-run.

ENERGY: RELATIONSHIP WITH OPEC

Question: Haven't you let OPEC dictate our energy policies? What are you prepared to do if OPEC announces another doubling of oil prices?

Answer:

THEME

WHEN I TOOK OFFICE IN JANUARY 1977, OPEC HAS A STRANGLEHOLD ON THE OIL-DEPENDENT ECONOMIES OF THE INDUSTRIALIZED WORLD. WE HAVE REVERSED -- IN A HISTORIC WAY -- THE DECADES OF GROWING DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL SINCE WORLD WAR II. MY ENERGY POLICY HAS STEADILY FREED OUR NATION FROM THE GRIP OF THIS DANGEROUS DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL. EVERY YEAR I HAVE BEEN IN OFFICE WE HAVE REDUCED OUR DEPENDENCE ON OPEC. AND I HAVE LED THE WAY TO INCREASING COOPERATION AMONG MAJOR CONSUMING NATIONS TO BE READY TO RESPOND TOGETHER TO ANY UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASES.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o Despite the experience of the oil embargo in 1973, the Republican Administrations that preceded me did little but talk about energy policy while our dependence on imported oil steadily increased. When I took office, the United States imported nearly half of the oil we used -- 8.8 million barrels per day.
- o Within 90 days after I took office, in my first major address to the Nation, I announced a comprehensive energy policy to increase domestic production and decrease energy consumption. These policies have decreased our oil imports by 2 million barrels per day since I took office; there is no better way to avoid having OPEC dictate our national choices and policies than by cutting down the only real weapon they have -- their oil supply. Production of coal, natural gas and crude oil are up. Solar and synthetic energy is being accelerated. Conservation is working.
- o I have also tried to lead the major industrial democracies to make a similar commitment, to reduce their oil imports and to develop alternative resources. In Tokyo in 1979, and then in Venice this past summer, we reached agreements that allow us to withstand -- together -- any challenge in the world.
- o As recently as this month, the member nations of the International Energy Agency agreed to moderate their activity in the spot market and to prevent market disruptions that the Iraq/Iran conflict might have caused. This effort could not be effective if it were attempted by just one nation, but the cooperative structure that we have forged has proved very effective in this tense period. Spot market prices remain calm and there are no indications of panic buying or hoarding. This shows the progress we have been making very clearly -- we are now prepared for the type of shortfalls caused by the war.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

COPY

JUN 27 1978

ENERGY: NUCLEAR POWER

Question: What do you see as the future of nuclear power in this country? Do you accept the Democratic Platform's position that existing nuclear plants can be phased-out as alternative fuel sources become available?

Answer:

THEME

WE MUST PUT SAFETY FIRST IN THE USE OF NUCLEAR POWER. FOR THE NEXT 20 YEARS OR SO, UNTIL WE HAVE DEVELOPED MORE SYNTHETIC FUELS AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES AND HAVE DEVELOPED FUSION, WE SIMPLY CANNOT MEET OUR ECONOMY'S NEEDS WITHOUT UTILIZING EVERY DOMESTIC SOURCE OF POWER AVAILABLE TO US -- INCLUDING NUCLEAR POWER. HOWEVER IT SHOULD BE A LAST RESORT, AND ULTIMATELY I DO HOPE WE CAN PHASE IT OUT.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o After the accident at Three Mile Island, I moved promptly to appoint the Kemeny Commission to make a careful study of that incident. They submitted an important set of recommendations, and I took a number of immediate steps to ensure that nuclear power plants were operated safely:
 - Reorganized the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and nominated a new Chairman.
 - Established the Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee, an expert advisory group to monitor the progress of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, other Federal agencies and others in improving the safety of nuclear power plants.
 - Put the Federal Emergency Management Agency in charge of all off-site emergency activities, and had them complete a review of all emergency plans.
 - Accelerated the program to place a resident Federal inspector at every reactor site, and I can now report that there are such inspectors at every operating reactor.
- o I have also established the Nation's first comprehensive radioactive waste management program:
 - Submitted my comprehensive program to the Congress and have worked with them to enact nuclear waste legislation.
 - Established the State Planning Council to provide an effective role for State and local governments in the development and implementation of our nuclear waste management program.

SOVIET GRAIN SUSPENSION

Question: Hasn't the grain embargo hurt our farmers more than it has hurt the Soviets? Under what circumstances would you be prepared to lift it?

Answer:

THEME

I TOOK THIS ACTION IN RESPONSE TO THE BLATANT DISREGARD OF THE SOVIET UNION FOR THE FREEDOM OF THE AFGHANISTAN PEOPLE AND THE THREAT THAT IMPLIED FOR WORLD SECURITY. AT THE SAME TIME I SUSPENDED SHIPMENT OF SOVIET GRAIN, I ACTED TO PROTECT AMERICA'S FARMERS FROM BEARING A DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE OF THE BURDEN. BOTH THE SUSPENSION AND THE OFFSETTING ACTIONS TO PROTECT FARMERS HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL. I WILL LIFT THE EMBARGO ONLY IF IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT: (1) IT HAS BECOME INEFFECTIVE OR (2) THE SOVIETS HAVE ALTERED THEIR BEHAVIOR.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o In the 1976 campaign, I promised America's farmers I would resort to an embargo only if our national security or our foreign policy interests were threatened ... that I would never embargo grain shipments just to keep farm prices down as the Republicans did on at least three occasions. I have kept that promise.
- o Armed Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan last year. I was faced with three options: (1) do nothing, (2) respond militarily, or (3) use economic sanctions. I chose the latter.
- o In addition to suspending all grain shipments above the 8 million ton level called for in the grain agreement, I ordered a curtailment of Russian fishing privileges in our waters, cut off the sale of high technology products, halted the sale of phosphate fertilizers, and called for a boycott of the Moscow Olympic games.
- o At the same time, I directed the Secretary of Agriculture to take whatever actions were necessary to ensure that American farmers did not bear a disproportionate share of the resulting burden. This was accomplished by isolating from the market slightly more than 17 million tons of grain.
- o By every measure, the suspension has accomplished its purpose. It has shorted the Soviets of 8 to 10 million tons of badly needed feed grains for their livestock. It has caused the Soviets to draw-down their stocks of grain to rock-bottom levels. It has caused meat and dairy production to fall. It has been a major embarrassment to Kremlin leaders. It has even caused worker unrest, both in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe.

- o The measures taken to protect America's farmers have also been successful. Not only did our isolation of grain provide needed support to farm prices, but through the aggressive promotion of farm exports, we increased the level above what we had expected before the suspension. Farm prices are up. As a result, we will set our fourth straight farm export record this year, \$40 billion ... a net positive contribution to our balance of payments of \$23 billion. We have expanded our world markets - e.g., to Mexico and China.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan has taken different positions on this issue at every turn. Just three months before I suspended grain shipments to the Soviet Union, he said: "If the Russians want to buy wheat from us ... I wouldn't sell it to them."
- o Yet, when it came time to campaign among farmers in the Iowa caucus, Governor Reagan had changed his position, saying the embargo shouldn't have been ordered, wouldn't hurt the Soviets, and would only hurt our farmers.
- o Beyond their vacillation, my Republican critics seem to forget their embargoes of 1973, 1974, and 1975 - embargoes that were totally unprovoked and were taken against some of our most trusted friends. They also fail to mention that these Republican Administrations never did a thing to protect our own farmers against the price depressing effects of those embargoes. Indeed, the reason for the embargoes was to drive down domestic farm prices.

B. Carter

- o I am convinced of the correctness of my decision to suspend the shipment of grain to the Soviets.
- o There are only two circumstances that would lead me to lift the suspension, neither of which currently prevail: (1) convincing evidence that the embargo is no longer effective or (2) a belief on my part that the Soviet threat to the rest of the world was being alleviated and that there was progress being made in the Soviets' withdrawal of their occupying troops from Afghanistan.
- o The future of the Soviet grain agreement, which expires September 30, 1981, has not been determined and will be considered later next year.

NOTE: The Soviets have nearly completed their purchases for shipment during the fifth year of the agreement (beginning October 1), with contracts now signed for 4.8 million tons of corn and 3.0 million tons of wheat. Although the International Longshoremen are once again threatening not to load the Soviet grain, we anticipate that the courts will keep the grain flowing with minimal delay.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o It is difficult to know what my opponents' view of farm policy really is. Earlier this year, he said he was not familiar with parity. He once said about farm price supports, "You subsidize the inefficient when you put a floor under the price." About dairy farmers, he said, "My view on dairy subsidies is that we are subsidizing those who could not compete at the expense of those who could possibly bring the price down in the market place."
- o Despite his life-long opposition to traditional farm programs, Governor Reagan's campaign statements imply that he would not try to dismantle farm subsidies. However, one cannot be very optimistic that they would receive the continuing attention and adjustment they require, especially given the Republican record.
- o Republican farm policies never have been noted for their vision. Rather, they have been characterized by confusion and contradiction. They have always preached free markets, but the record shows that they practiced price controls and export embargoes. They vetoed price support legislation, usually when it was most desperately needed. They repeatedly raised our import quotas to allow foreign dairy products to flood our markets. They cut food aid to hungry nations when it was most needed. In short, it is a sorry record. Not only does it display a lack of respect for the functioning of market forces, but it reveals an insensitivity to the economic and human problems of the ordinary farm family.

B. Carter

- o While I am pleased that my Administration has turned around the disastrous situation we inherited and I am proud of the policy we constructed in doing so, there is more to be done. American agriculture is on the threshold of a whole new era -- an era of tightening world food supplies, mounting pressures on our land and water resources, continued strains on our transportation and marketing system, the need to press forward on developing new technologies and production practices, an even more pressing need to safeguard agriculture's access to limited energy supplies and to nurture the development of alternative sources. While this will be an era of excitement and opportunity, it will also be one of rapid change and adjustment.
- o In this era of opportunity and change, I intend to pursue policies built on the solid foundation we have already laid, but giving particular stress to:
 - ensuring that farm prices and support levels keep pace with rising production costs;
 - further actions to deregulate agriculture;
 - the promotion of farm exports, including stepped-up promotion of "value added" products like meat, poultry, breeding animals, and raw products.

- an intensive effort to restructure and rebuild our agricultural transportation system.
- the continued accelerated development of alternative energy sources (gasohol) farm crops.

- Real outlay growth in basic research will secure our technological base for future growth and development.
- Employment and training programs, especially for our youth, will enhance the skills and productive capacity of our people.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan has promised massive tax cuts, higher defense spending and a balanced budget -- but the numbers do add up.
- o He has recently proposed additional spending increases which make large future deficits and inflation even more likely -- examples: Social Security earnings test removal, tuition tax credits, inheritance tax repeal.
- o He has promised big spending cuts, but refuses to tell us which programs will be cut. All he can say is that waste will be eliminated. In the current Fiscal Year he has promised cuts of \$13-\$19 billion, but still has provided no details.
- o He presided over real expenditure growth as Governor of California that was the highest in the State's history -- 126% increase in spending.

B. Carter

- o Inflation is the most serious threat to our economic security. We must not run the risk of large, inflationary budget deficits from massive across-the-board tax cuts.
- o Moderate tax cuts, consistent with fiscal restraint and emphasizing investment and industrial growth, not consumption, is the responsible approach.
- o This approach will allow us to create a million new jobs by the end of 1982, but still bring down inflation.
- o In the longer term, budgetary goals require strong, non-inflationary economic growth. This requires savings, investment, and attention to structural change in the economy. My program addresses these problems. The Reagan program instead offers a massive consumption-oriented tax cut.

Farm Policy

Question: Haven't your farm policies produced lower incomes and prices for farmers in recent years? How do you propose to remedy this without fueling inflation?

Answer:

THEME

IN ASSUMING THE PRESIDENCY, I INHERITED A FARM ECONOMY THAT WAS IN A STATE OF SERIOUS DECLINE, MADE WORSE BY THE CONFUSED AND CONTRADICTIONARY FARM POLICIES OF PRIOR REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS. MY ADMINISTRATION HAS SUCCESSFULLY TURNED THIS SITUATION AROUND. NOT ONLY DO WE HAVE CLEAR, CONSISTENT SETS OF FARM POLICIES THAT WORK, WE HAVE THE RESULTS TO PROVE THAT THEY WORK -- HIGHER PRICES, HIGHER INCOMES, HIGHER EXPORTS.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o When I entered office, grain prices were in a tailspin, cattle producers were liquidating their herds after four years of heavy losses, the bottom was dropping out of farm income, consumers and producers were engaged in open confrontation, and our nation's reputation as a reliable exporter of farm products had been seriously tarnished.
- o We immediately began to correct this. I began by appointing a farmer as Secretary of Agriculture. We then took a number of steps to eliminate governmental interference in those decisions that were better left to the individual farmer. We established this nation's first farmer-owned grain reserve. We brought farm price supports in line with rising production costs. We re-established our reputation within the world market and negotiated across-the-board reductions in foreign trade barriers.
- o The results speak for themselves. By every meaningful measure -- total gross farm income, total net farm income, total production, total consumption, total farm exports -- the record of the first four years of this Administration top any previous four-year period in history.

NOTE: Reagan is likely to point to the drop in net farm income between 1979 and 1980 (we now estimate a 24 percent drop). Counter-points, if he does are:

- (1) since farm income varies significantly year-to-year, the only meaningful comparisons are across periods of at least 3-4 years,
- (2) even with the decline, it will be over 25% above the last year of the Republican Administration, and
- (3) thanks to very strong markets, here and abroad, it is already on the rise and will be significantly higher

- o If the ITC finds injury, I will ask my Trade Representative to initiate high-level contacts with the Japanese government immediately. I will seriously consider all possible options, including measures to restrict imports.
- o Whatever the ITC recommends, however, I am confident that we will lick the problem of Japanese imports.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o My opponent has not given us any cohesive policy for addressing the problems of the automobile. He has blamed almost all of the problems of the industry on government regulations.
- o After first saying he was against any steps to restrict imports Governor Reagan stated in Michigan that something must be done to stem the flow of Japanese imports, but has not specifically advocated restraining Japanese imports.

B. Carter

- o I see a bright future for the U.S. auto industry - one that's already starting. We will increasingly make the most fuel-efficient, safest, soundest cars in the world.
- o The key to the revitalization of our auto industry is the industry's effort to produce more small, fuel-efficient cars in this country. With the new 1981 models, we are well on our way to achieving this goal.
- o To ensure that government is doing everything possible to help the auto industry put American auto workers back on the job, I have established an Auto Industry Committee. On this Committee, business, labor and government will work together to help restore the auto industry to full health.
- o This Committee will address the full range of issues affecting the auto industry, including imports, regulations, tax policy and other critical issues. There is no question in my mind that, working together, we can lick the problems of the auto industry and Japanese imports.

BUDGET QUESTIONS: GENERAL APPROACH

THEME

I HAVE A SOLID RECORD OF CUTTING THE REAL GROWTH IN THE BUDGET BELOW THAT OF PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATIONS. I ALSO HAVE FOUR YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN ESTABLISHING NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND MAKING THE TOUGH BUDGETARY DECISIONS TO MEET THEM. MY POLICY OF FISCAL RESTRAINT IS ESSENTIAL TO REDUCING INFLATION AND BUILDING A SECURE ECONOMIC FUTURE.

MY OPPONENT HAS NO EXPERIENCE IN MAKING THESE HARD CHOICES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. HE APPARENTLY DOES NOT UNDERSTAND THAT TOUGH CHOICES EXIST. SO, HE PROMISES HUGE TAX CUTS, MASSIVE INCREASES IN DEFENSE SPENDING, MAINTAINING ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMS AND BALANCING THE BUDGET AT THE SAME TIME. THE RESULT WOULD BE HUGE BUDGET DEFICITS, AND WORSE INFLATION, IN THE 1980s.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o The budget must be viewed in terms of real program expenditures in relation to the size of the economy. The record shows budgetary restraint.
 - In my four budgets real outlays have grown at an average rate of 1.6%. In the two previous Republican Administrations the rate was 2-1/2%.
 - Real defense outlays have grown by nearly 3-1/2% each year; in the Nixon-Ford Administrations they fell by nearly 3-1/2% per year.
 - The budget deficit for the current fiscal year is projected to be 1 to 1-1/2% of GNP. When I ran for office the deficit was over 4% of GNP.
- o Within this overall context of restraint, I have directed budget expenditures to programs of highest national priority.
 - Real defense spending has increased by almost 3-1/2% per year after a steady eight-year decline under two Republican Administrations.
 - Major new initiatives in energy conservation and supply, funded by the windfall profit tax, have established a long-overdue energy policy to reduce our dependence on oil imported from insecure foreign sources.

- o In my first two years I concentrated on ending the recession and restoring solid growth. Since then I have placed primary emphasis on fighting inflation.
- o Finally, experience has taught me to be even more aware than I was four years ago how stubborn and persistent inflation is. Because of that heightened awareness, I have been especially vigilant in the past year to prevent actions that might lead to renewed inflation. I successfully opposed a quickie election year tax cut. I have proposed to the Congress for enactment next year a very careful and prudent economic recovery program that is in sharp contrast to the massive and inflationary across-the-board tax cuts that are the centerpiece of Governor Reagan's economic policy. I wish he had learned as much as I have over the past four years about the strength of inflation. If he had, he would not be proposing a tax cut that will cost \$1 trillion over the next seven years.

COPY

1982 FEB

AUTO IMPORTS

Question: Do you favor restrictions on the number of Japanese autos imported into the U.S.?

Answer:

THEME

WE HAVE A GOOD SOUND RECORD OF WORKING TO REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY. I AM COMMITTED TO A POLICY OF CONTINUING TO HELP THE INDUSTRY REGAIN ITS STRENGTH AND TECHNOLOGICAL LEAD. I WILL AWAIT THE DECISION OF THE ITC BEFORE MAKING A FINAL DECISION. BUT I WILL BE PREPARED IF THEY FIND INJURY TO OUR INDUSTRY FROM IMPORTS. BUT I HAVE ASKED THE JAPANESE NOT TO EXPAND THEIR PRODUCTION CAPACITY TO SELL MORE CARS TO THE U.S. AND TO BE SENSITIVE TO AMERICAN JOBS IN THEIR EXPORT POLICY.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- COPY
JUN 27 1985
- o In 1977, I strongly urged the leaders of the U.S. auto industry in the Cabinet Room to begin building fuel-efficient cars. My warnings went unheeded.
 - o I worked with the Congress to pass tough fuel economy standards. This got the industry to start making fuel-efficient cars earlier than they would have otherwise done.
 - o My Administration has done a great deal to revitalize our domestic automobile industry. We have reduced the regulatory burden on the automobile industry by more than \$600 million; we have accelerated the government's purchases of autos and trucks and taken steps to ensure that every car and truck the government buys is made in America; we have proposed new tax incentives to help the industry retool for the future; and we have provided substantial new aid to the workers and communities most affected by the rapid changes in the automobile industry.
 - o We also are working to open the Japanese markets to American made cars and parts, and to encourage Japanese automakers to make additional investments in this country.
 - o I am extremely concerned about the level of Japanese auto imports and their effect on the U.S. auto industry and its workers.
 - o I already have asked the U.S. International Trade Commission to accelerate its investigation of the auto industry. The ITC will report to me on November 10 whether the auto industry has been injured by imports. If the ITC finds injury, they will submit their recommendations for relief to me on November 24.
 - o In anticipation of the ITC's decision, I have asked my Special Trade Representative to complete the necessary staff work so that I can respond immediately to the ITC's reports.

- o My economic program for the eighties, in contrast, is restrained, responsible and designed to promote the long-term growth of the economy. It devotes 50 percent of the tax cuts to investment incentives and another 1/3 to offset increased Social Security costs on business, compared to Reagan's 10 percent. I would simplify and accelerate depreciation to promote investment. I would make the investment tax credit partially refundable so that firms which have no earnings but still have substantial investment needs, can benefit from the investment tax credit at the time when it will be most helpful to their cash flow.
- o I would expand public investment as well in long-term investments in our Nation's highways, ports and railroads. I have also proposed an expansion in human resources programs; no investment has a higher payoff than an investment in workers' skills and experience. I have proposed an expansion in support for research and development which underlies industrial innovation and productivity growth. And I have proposed public investments in conservation and weatherization that will increase our economic and national security.
- o I believe that the complex economic problems that will face our Nation in the 80's require not a retreat by the Federal government, but rather a new partnership among the government and the private sector. To foster the cooperation necessary to master the economic challenges of the 80's I will establish a new advisory body, comprised of representatives of business, labor and the public; the President's Economic Revitalization Board, and will continue to work with our labor-business-government boards for steel, autos and coal.
- o I recognize that economic policy must also address the immediate difficulties faced by workers and their families in changing economic circumstances. I have proposed a new, temporary Federal Supplemental Benefits program to provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment assistance. For the longer term, a 10 percent tax credit for investments in areas suffering from a declining industrial base will be proposed. Passage of my Economic Development Proposal now before the Congress will provide productive employment for those in distressed areas, and passage of my youth bill will provide training and employment for 450,000 young people when fully implemented.
- o Finally, to reduce personal tax burdens on those most afflicted by inflation and the rise in social security taxes for 1981 I have proposed an 8 percent tax credit to offset the rise in social security taxes in 1981, an expansion of the earned income tax credit for those families who pay social security taxes yet earn too little to pay income taxes, and a special tax deduction will be offered to help offset the "marriage penalty."
- o This program will enable us to meet our underlying economic problems, to re-industrialize, and to avoid fueling inflationary pressures.

CHANGES IN ECONOMIC POLICY

Question: Hasn't your economic policy been one of continuous new policies, new budget directions, new anti-inflation initiatives? Why haven't you been able to stick with a single economic policy?

Answer:

- o The press has exaggerated the number of policies. I'm required to submit a new budget for each fiscal year to deal with the expected economic circumstances. This does not mean we had a new economic policy each year. Even minor changes in my voluntary wage-price guidelines were counted by some as a new policy.
- o My basic economic philosophy and my approach to economic policy have been quite consistent over the past four years. My aim is:
 - to encourage healthy economic growth;
 - to do so carefully and prudently so as not to make the government itself an engine of inflation;
 - to meet quickly and decisively any new inflationary threats from abroad -- like last year's massive oil price increase;
 - to restrain the growth of Federal spending so as to be able to provide responsible and noninflationary tax reduction for the American people;
 - and to make our country less dependent on foreign oil.
- o My basic policy goals have not changed. But economic circumstances at home and abroad do change, sometimes very swiftly and unpredictably. And specific budgetary, monetary and other economic measures have to be promptly set in motion to deal with those changes. Consistent economic policy does not mean sticking one's head in the sand. It would be the height of irresponsibility to stand idly by while inflationary or recessionary forces run unchecked. All Presidents have recognized this and changed their economic policies accordingly.
- o Let me give an example. In March of this year, as the last surge of oil price hikes was underway, inflation threatened to get out of hand. Even though I had just sent a new budget to the Congress, I convened Congressional leaders to work with me on cutting additional amounts of Federal spending, in order to deal with the intensified inflation. The medicine worked. While inflation is still too high, it has receded sharply from that in the early months of this year.
- o In all of this, I did not change my basic approach. But I did move quickly with specific new policies to meet a new threat to our country's economy. F.D.R. said he would continue to experiment in dealing with an intolerable problem until he found the right solution. He wasn't accused of inconsistency.

ECONOMIC PROPOSAL COMPARISON AND OVERVIEW

Question: How would you compare your economic revitalization program with Governor Reagan's tax cut proposal? How does your economic revitalization program help the average working person or family? Won't the additional Federal spending be inflationary?

Answer:

THEME

MY RECORD IN ECONOMIC POLICY IS NOT AS GOOD AS I WOULD LIKE, BUT THE ECONOMY IS IMPROVING IN MANY AREAS. EMPLOYMENT GROWTH DURING MY TERM HAS BEEN FASTER THAN IN ANY PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION. I HAVE PUT INTO PLACE A SERIES OF POLICIES WHICH WILL LEAD TO A MORE PRODUCTIVE AND LESS INFLATIONARY AMERICAN ECONOMY IN THE FUTURE. MY ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION PROGRAM IS PRUDENT, RESTRAINED, AND CAREFULLY DESIGNED TO INCREASE INVESTMENT, PRODUCTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT, AND TO REDUCE INFLATION. MY OPPONENT, ON THE OTHER HAND, HAS PROPOSED A SINGLE, SIMPLISTIC ANSWER TO THE COMPLEX ECONOMIC PROBLEMS WHICH FACE OUR NATION -- A MASSIVE, ACROSS-THE-BOARD INDIVIDUAL TAX CUT WHICH WOULD BE REGRESSIVE, INFLATIONARY, AND COMPLETELY UNRESPONSIVE TO THE CRITICAL NEED TO INCREASE INVESTMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO SPUR FASTER PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE 80'S.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

COPY

- o We have had a difficult year but the trends are favorable. I have led this Nation out of one recession which I inherited and we are coming out of one which hit during my Administration. Inflation, while still too high, has come down and has averaged % over the last months.
- o During the first three years of my Administration, 8.8 million new jobs were created -- more jobs than were created in any other Administration in history and twice as many as during the previous Republican Administration.
- o Against formidable political opposition, I have put into place a comprehensive and coherent National Energy Program, and its effects are now evident: we have cut our foreign oil consumption by two million barrels since I took office and no other nation on earth can match that record.
- o I have put into place policies to increase the productivity of our economy. From 1976 to 1979 investment has increased 25%. Perhaps even more important has been my success in reducing inefficient, productivity-reducing regulations: we have deregulated the airlines, the railroads, trucking and the banking industries. These actions have already saved consumers billions of dollars as they increase competition and the efficiency of the American economy.

- o I have implemented a prudent and responsible fiscal policy, and after decades during which other administrations only talked about spending restraint, I have achieved it: the growth in real Federal budget outlays has been cut in half compared to the rate of the previous Republican Administration. And, in 1981 the Federal deficit as a percent of GNP will be less than half what it was in 1976.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o I have learned the bitter lessons of inflation. I will not over-inflate the economy but Governor Reagan's Kemp-Roth tax cut would do so.
- o In contrast to my balanced, moderate approach to economic policy, Governor Reagan has proposed one single, simplistic proposal to deal with all of the complex economic problems of our country -- a massive, across-the-board, 30% individual income tax cut -- a rich man's tax cut which would flood the Nation with excess dollars. There is no recognition of the crucial need to reduce our vulnerability to OPEC oil price increases.
- o There is no emphasis in his program of the critical need to encourage private investment in plant and equipment. I believe that the tax code must provide investment incentives so that our workers will be equipped with the most modern and efficient capital in the world. That is apparently less important to Governor Reagan, since he devotes only 10 percent of his tax cut to investment incentives.
- o Further, Governor Reagan's tax cuts would benefit the rich at the expense of the rest of us. A person earning \$200,000 would receive 35 times as large a tax cut under the Reagan proposal as a person earning \$20,000 a year.
- o Most importantly, Governor Reagan has not learned the lessons of the past few years about inflation. We cannot afford to fuel inflation. Yet, his proposal is extremely inflationary -- his own running mate said it would bring 30% inflation. That is not unlikely when you cut taxes by \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, and remain committed to massive defense spending, protecting entitlement programs, and promise new spending programs.

B. Carter

COPY

- o I, too, am committed to reducing personal tax burdens, but spending restraint is an essential prerequisite. Massive tax cuts which primarily benefit the rich and which pick the pockets of the rest of Americans by generating huge, inflationary pressures cannot be tolerated.

- o My program of budgetary firmness has meant a decline in the rate of growth of federal spending I inherited.

2. THE FUTURE

COPY

A. Reagan

- o The key is I have learned from hard experience the difficulty of fighting inflation and the dangers of over-stimulation. Mr. Reagan would repeat the errors of the past by a highly stimulative, consumption-oriented tax cut for the wealthy. Governor Reagan's proposals stand in sharp contrast to mine. Instead of a targeted program of investment incentives, about 85% of his program would be Reagan-Kemp-Roth notion of a single across-the-board personal income tax cut. This proposal is so poor an idea that the Governor's own running mate opposed it. So did many of his own economic advisers. So did former President Ford. When Republicans refuse to support the economic program of their own nominee, you can bet they have good reasons. And they do.
 - It would be inflationary. Unless accompanied by enormous budget cuts -- cuts that the Governor keeps promising but never spells out -- his plans would cause budget deficits of \$100 billion or more, and increase inflation. His own running mate called the proposal "economic voodoo" and said it would raise the inflation rate to 30 percent.
 - It would be regressive. In 1983, his proposal would give \$175 to a family making \$12,000, but \$15,000 to a family making \$200,000.
 - It provides the vast majority of its tax relief for consumption, not investment and productivity. Although his program does include a proposal for accelerated depreciation, most of his tax relief is not tied to the investment we need for productivity.
- o My opponent also claims that he will cut spending enough for the nation to afford this enormous tax cut and still balance the budget. But somehow he can't come up with any programs to cut. In fact, in the past few weeks, he's been promising more wherever he travels. At our last count, he was at \$140 billion in 1983 and still spending.

B. Carter

- o I am committed that ours remain the most productive economy on earth.
- o I have proposed an economic renewal program for prompt enactment next year that would help increase productivity and create jobs (1 million within 2 years) without increasing inflation as well. It includes:
 - vastly accelerated depreciation schedules for plant and equipment to encourage modernization (40%);

- targeted tax programs for investment;
- aid to workers and communities;
- public investment in our transportation system and in the scientific research that maintains our economic leadership;
- a new partnership between government and industry, to solve problems cooperatively through an Economic Revitalization Board;
- a reduction in Social Security taxes by an income tax credit that reduces inflation and leaves the Social Security Trust Fund secure.

o Furthermore, we have begun to find new ways to fight inflation. My proposal to offset social security tax increases will reduce inflation in the immediate future. I am also exploring other ways to use the tax system to help moderate wage and price behavior.

- Second, we must continue to control the growth of Federal spending, and reduce the burden of regulation and taxation. I have already proven that we can do this, by cutting the rate of spending growth to half that of my Republican predecessor. My proposal to offset social security taxes will help reduce inflation in the immediate future. We will continue to deregulate the economy as I have done with airlines, rails, trucking and banks.
- I am strongly opposed, however, to committing the government to hundreds of billions in tax cuts with no specific plan to reduce spending. Here again I differ sharply from Governor Reagan, whose Kemp-Roth tax cut would be highly inflationary.
- Third, I believe that in the years immediately ahead America is going to have to invest heavily in its own future
 - o both to modernize its industry, create jobs, and
 - o to build the new facilities we need to make our energy future secure.
- o That is why the Economic Revitalization Plan I have proposed the Congress enact next year is carefully targeted to increase business investment. It is a program that will put people - one million new jobs within two years - to work and increase productivity to maintain our economic strength without rekindling inflation. And here again I differ from Governor Reagan: almost 90 percent of his massive tax cuts are for consumption-oriented tax relief and only 10 percent go to promote investment incentives.
- o Ours is the most productive economy on earth. Working together, it will remain so.

COPY

10/27/85

HANDLING OF ECONOMY

Question: Given our problems with unemployment, recession and inflation, why do you believe your handling of the economy merits another four years?

COPY

Answer:

THEME

THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE BEEN HARD FOR OUR NATION, BUT RECESSION IS OVER AND INFLATION HAS ABATED. WE HAVE HAD MANY SUCCESSES AS WELL AS DISAPPOINTMENTS. I HAVE PROPOSED AND BEGUN AN ECONOMIC RENEWAL PROGRAM AND AN ENERGY PROGRAM THAT WILL CREATE JOBS AND STRENGTHEN OUR NATION'S INDUSTRY. I HAVE ALREADY TAKEN STEPS TO FIGHT INFLATION AND I HAVE PROPOSED NEW PROGRAMS TO CONTINUE THIS FIGHT. MY OPPONENT, BY CONTRAST, PROMISES TO SOLVE ALL THE PROBLEMS OF THE ECONOMY PRIMARILY BY ONE SINGLE, SIMPLE AND WRONG IDEA: A LARGE ACROSS-THE-BOARD TAX CUT THAT EVEN HIS OWN RUNNING MATE ADMITTED WOULD BE INFLATIONARY AND A MISTAKE.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o Our nation's economy has suffered from rising inflation for fifteen years due to the costs of the Vietnam War, the Soviet grain sale of 1972, OPEC price shocks in 1974 and 1979, and declining productivity. In the last two years, the nation's oil bill has more than doubled, making the problem worse. We have learned through hard experience the tenacity of inflationary forces and the importance of opposing them continually, intelligently and well.
- o In the past four years, I proposed and began the nation's first real energy program to help meet this challenge. And we are beginning to do so. Today, we buy two million barrels a day less oil from OPEC than we did in 1977. This means our nation's economy will be more stable and have lower inflation in the future.
- o To increase productivity in our basic industries, I have brought together business and labor to meet with government and solve problems cooperatively. In the coal industry, working together for the first time, we reached agreement on ways to make mining better and more efficient. And we have begun to do this in the automobile and steel industries.
- o I have worked to reduce paperwork (15% reduction) and cut red tape that can frustrate our natural enterprise. My programs for deregulation of the trucking, airline, railroad and banking industries mark the most important restructuring of relations between government and industry since the New Deal. For the first time, I have set strict limits on agency paperwork requirements.

-- We have put in place the Nation's first energy program. It includes a conservation and solar bank, a synthetic fuels corporation, and an end to the dangerous practice of keeping oil and gas prices artificially low.

-- As a result, we import about 25 percent less oil than we did when I took office. More oil and gas wells are being drilled. And we use energy more efficiently than ever before.

- o I have cut the growth of Federal spending in half, while increasing support for our Nation's defense as well as other critical needs such as energy conservation and youth unemployment.
- o The dollar is now strong. And the United States -- unlike all other oil importing nations -- has been reducing its balance of payments deficit.
- o We have eliminated regulations which stifled free enterprise in airline, trucking, and railroad industries and in the banking and financial institutions.
- o Obviously, I am not pleased with the record on inflation nor with the current rate of unemployment. But the trends are in the right direction. We were not able to absorb completely the shock of doubled OPEC prices. And I would have to admit that, early in my Administration, we underestimated the strength of inflationary forces which had been building for the previous ten years. Inflation has been reduced sharply. The consumer price index has averaged percent over the last months. Unemployment has dropped the past several months and should continue to do so. Auto sales, industrial production and homebuilding are up.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

COPY

- o I have learned a great deal from my experience. Most importantly, I have learned the dangers of over-stimulating the economy. That's why I opposed an election year tax cut and it's why I so strongly oppose the Reagan Kemp-Roth massive tax cut. Governor Reagan's proposals stand in sharp contrast to mine. He clearly has not learned the lessons of the past few years on inflation. Instead of a targeted program of investment incentives, about 90% of his program is the Kemp-Roth notion of a single across-the-board personal income tax cut. It is a rich man's tax cut which would flood America with excess dollars. This proposal is so poor an idea that the Governor's own running mate opposed it. So did many of his own economic advisers. So did former President Ford. When Republicans refuse to support the economic program of their own nominee, you can bet they have good reasons. And they do.

- It would be inflationary. Unless accompanied by enormous budget cuts -- cuts that the Governor keeps promising but never spells out -- his plans would cause budget deficits of over \$100 billion and increase inflation. His own running mate called the proposal "economic voodoo" and said it would raise the inflation rate to 30 percent. Inflation is so difficult to root out of our system that we cannot afford to gamble on an economic program that so many knowledgeable people believe to be very inflationary.
- It would be unfair. His proposal would give \$175 to a teacher making \$12,000, but the corporate officer making \$200,000 would receive \$15,000. It is, simply stated, a rich man's tax bill.
- It provides tax relief for consumption, not investment and productivity. Only 10 percent of his tax program is devoted to stimulating the investment we need for productivity.
- o My opponent also claims that he will cut spending enough for the nation to afford this enormous tax cut and still balance the budget. But for some reason he cannot name a single cut. That will make it pretty hard to balance the budget. And in the past few weeks, he's been promising new programs that will make it even harder. At last count he was at \$140 billion in 1983 and still promising.
- o My opponent seems to believe that government should play almost no role in the economy at all. While I worked with the steel industry to help solve the problems of this vital industry, he seems to think government should keep hands off. I suppose that's why he thinks we can solve our energy problem by giving it all to the oil companies.
- o I don't think a person who believes that the minimum wage is one of the principal causes of unemployment - as Mr. Reagan said - can develop answers to reduce unemployment.

B. Carter

COPY

- o My economic renewal program concentrates on investment and productivity incentives to create jobs -- so we grow without rekindling inflation by a massive stimulus to consumers. I have founded my economic program on three principles:
 - First, that we must achieve energy security through the comprehensive energy program now in place. This has reversed the decades of growing dependence on foreign oil. Every year of my Presidency we have imported less foreign oil than the year before. Here I differ strongly with Governor Reagan, who has said repeatedly that all we need to do to solve our energy problem is to leave it in the hands of the oil companies.

COPY
SECONDARY QUESTIONS

JUN 27 1960

ECONOMY

COPY
JUN 27 1983

Wage and Price Policy

Question: Are you planning to continue your wage and price guideline program next year and beyond? Would you consider any tightening of the guidelines? Wouldn't you concede that they have not been very successful in restraining inflation?

Answer:

- o The voluntary wage and price standards have been an important part of my program.
- o The voluntary wage and price standards did work. Quantitative estimates show that the rate of wage inflation in 1979 was 1-1½ percentage points less than it would have been.
- o The wage and price standards program was critical in our ability to prevent the 125% increase in OPEC oil prices in 1979 from driving us to a permanent underlying inflation rate of over 10 percent. Policies to encourage wage and price restraint are important in our fight to bring down the underlying rate of inflation.
- o When I announced the Economic Revitalization Program on August 28 I explicitly noted that my advisors would be examining ways to extend the voluntary program for private wage and price restraint. In addition, I said that as there is room for further tax reductions in the coming years we must look for ways to use those tax reductions to encourage wage and price moderation. There will be some voluntary incomes policy for next year.
- o By contrast Governor Reagan has absolutely no proposal for slowing the underlying rate of inflation. Indeed, he proposes massive tax cuts which would only create huge deficits and rekindle inflation.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT



ENERGY: CONSERVATION

Question: You are putting a lot of Federal money into energy conservation programs. What are you really getting for your investment?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE PUT IN PLACE OUR FIRST ENERGY PROGRAM. GOVERNOR REAGAN HAS NO REAL ENERGY PROGRAM EXCEPT LETTING THE BIG OIL COMPANIES "LOOSE". CONSERVATION IS THE QUICKEST, CHEAPEST WAY TO DECREASE OUR DANGEROUS DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL. MY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS HAVE SHOWN DRAMATIC RESULTS AND I WILL BE PROUD TO CONTINUE THEM.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o We are consuming almost 2 million barrels per day less than when I took office (from 18.4 mmb/d in 1976 to 16.3 mmb/d in 1980). Two-thirds of the savings comes from conservation and only a small part is due to the recession. We are consuming 8% less gasoline than one year ago.
- o These changes are in large part a result of the policies that I have put into place in these last four years, such as:
 - The National Energy Conservation Policy Act which provides grants and other incentives for energy conservation in schools, hospitals, residences, automobiles, and major home appliances.
 - The Energy Tax Act, which established the first tax incentives for residential conservation. Over 10 million Americans have used this new tax credit to insulate their homes.
 - For low-income Americans, a Federal program is weatherizing more than 23,000 homes every month.
 - The mandatory Building Temperature Regulations for non-residential buildings have saved between 200,000 and 400,000 barrels of oil equivalent per day.
 - Domestic automakers have exceeded Federal automobile fuel efficiency standards in 1978, 1979 and 1980. Increasingly stringent standards will save some 500,000 b/d by 1985 and over 1 million b/d by 1990.
 - The new Energy Conservation and Solar Development Bank will encourage conservation by low interest loans.

- the 55 mph speed limit has saved 228,000 b/d of gasoline, and has saved 40,000 lives, according to the Department of Transportation.
- In Fiscal Year 1981, the Federal Government will spend more than \$2 billion to promote energy conservation, yielding more than \$5 billion in nationwide residential and industrial conservation investments.
- o Some say that these decreases in consumption were actually caused by the recession. But last year, when real GNP grew 2.3%, our total energy consumption dropped, for the first time in a non-recessionary year in almost 30 years. Gasoline consumption dropped 10% last December, several months before the recession really hit.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan regards all of these programs as "government meddling." His party's platform is against the 55 mile per hour speed limit, against the fuel efficiency standards in cars, and against Federal conservation programs. He places little emphasis on conservation.

B. Carter

- o I will continue to implement my programs to encourage the American people to conserve energy. I believe conservation is an essential ingredient of a responsible energy program. My program will lead us to energy security.
- o The new Energy Conservation and Solar Development Bank in H.U.D. will soon be started to speed conservation.

ENERGY: CRUDE OIL DECONTROL

Question: Wouldn't we produce more oil if we immediately decontrolled crude oil prices? Why do you oppose that?

Answer:

THEME

MY RECORD IN ENCOURAGING INCREASED ENERGY PRODUCTION IS VERY SOUND, OVER HALF OF OUR DOMESTIC OIL PRODUCTION IS ALREADY FREE FROM PRICE CONTROLS, AND THE REMAINING CONTROLS ARE NOT A SIGNIFICANT CONSTRAINT ON PRODUCTION. FURTHER, I AM CERTAIN THAT IF I HAD CHOSEN "OVERNIGHT" DECONTROL IN 1979, AS IS NOW URGED BY GOVERNOR REAGAN, IT WOULD HAVE CAUSED A PROFOUND AND UNACCEPTABLE SHOCK TO OUR ECONOMY. I AM PHASING OUT PRICE CONTROLS CAREFULLY, IN A PHASED-WAY, TO AVOID INFLATIONARY SHOCK.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT (RECORD)

- o On April 5, 1979, I directed that domestic crude oil price and allocation controls be ended by September 30, 1981. Over half of U.S. oil production is already free from price controls, and the decontrol schedule is steadily releasing additional volumes.
- o The remaining price controls are not a serious constraint on domestic crude oil production today. The number of operating oil and gas rigs reached an all-time high this month (3,164) and there are more new wells being drilled this year than any year in history. The real constraint on production today is the availability of drilling rigs.
- o The Department of Energy estimates that if I had imposed the immediate decontrol of all crude oil in April 1979, it would have caused about a 1-1/2% increase in our Nation's inflation rate in 1980 above that caused by phased decontrol.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

Governor Reagan has called for the immediate decontrol of all oil prices. But he has offered no specific information on how much of an increase would result, or at what price to our economy. Such an action now would be very inflationary. I do not believe he fully understands the consequences of his proposal.

3. CARTER FUTURE

- o I will continue to move in a responsible manner toward complete decontrol, taking into account economic effects as well as energy policy.
- o I am convinced we will be able to continue our high record of exploration and development.

ENERGY: EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AUTHORITY

Question:

Would you consider reimposing oil price controls in the event that OPEC prices began to skyrocket? Would you seek the extension of the price control authority just in case it were necessary to use it some time in the future?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE PUT OUR FIRST ENERGY PROGRAM IN PLACE. GOVERNOR REAGAN HAS NO REAL ENERGY PROGRAM EXCEPT TO TURN THE OIL COMPANIES "LOOSE". DOMESTIC PRICE CONTROLS HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO IMPACT ON SKYROCKETING OPEC PRICES; THEY MERELY DISCOURAGE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF CRUDE OIL. HOWEVER, IN THE NEXT SESSION OF CONGRESS, I EXPECT TO ADDRESS THE MANY IMPACTS OF THE END OF CRUDE OIL CONTROLS IN SEPTEMBER 1981. I EXPECT TO SEEK CERTAIN APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY IN CASE OF A SEVERE INTERNATIONAL ENERGY SUPPLY EMERGENCY.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o I look forward to September 1981 as the culmination of the phased decontrol of crude oil that I announced in April 1979.
- o If OPEC prices were to increase today, the reimposition of price controls would not be the answer. Domestic price controls have no impact on OPEC prices, except that they may hold down domestic production and so increase our dependence on imported oil. I would consider the use of emergency allocation measures, however, to ensure that the available supply was fairly distributed.
- o I am concerned that I retain the necessary standby authority to deal with a severe energy supply emergency, in case one should arise after September 1981. I expect that I will seek such authority in the next session of Congress.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

Governor Reagan claims to be absolutely opposed to all controls on crude oil, so he would presumably not want any emergency authority to be continued. He has never explained how he would deal with a severe energy supply interruption.

B. Carter

I intend to phase out all domestic crude oil controls on schedule, but I also plan to remain equipped with the necessary authority to respond to an energy supply emergency.

This is a responsible approach, it is an approach which will provide us with needed energy security.

Energy: "Lock-Up" of Federal Lands
And Resources

Question: If you really want to increase domestic energy production, why do you hold back so much Federal land with valuable energy resources?

Answer

THEME

I HAVE PUT OUR FIRST ENERGY PROGRAM IN PLACE; GOVERNOR REAGAN HAS NO REAL PROGRAM EXCEPT TURNING THE OIL COMPANIES "LOOSE". THE CHARGE THAT I HAVE "LOCKED-UP" THE ENERGY RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LANDS IS SIMPLY MISTAKEN. UNDER MY ADMINISTRATION, I HAVE OPENED UP MORE FEDERAL LANDS FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT THAN WERE EVER AVAILABLE BEFORE. THERE MUST BE A PROPER BALANCE BETWEEN MAINTAINING OUR NATIONAL PARKS AND SCENIC AREAS AND ENERGY EXPLORATION. I HAVE PROVIDED THAT BALANCE.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o Some have charged that the Administration sponsored Alaska Lands Bill will make that State's energy resources unavailable. In fact, our legislation leaves over 90% of the promising oil and gas acreage available for development, and 100% of the Outer Continental Shelf (where most of the oil and gas will probably be found) is available. Further, we have submitted separate legislation calling for private leasing of the National Petroleum Reserve.
- o Onshore Oil and Gas Development:
 - Of the 822 million acres of Federal mineral estate, approximately 500 million acres are available for oil and gas leasing.
 - In addition, 100 million acres are under lease and less than 1% of all oil, gas and geothermal leases have surface occupancy restrictions.
- o Wilderness Areas:
 - Of the 174 million acres of public lands reviewed for wilderness characteristics, 124 million acres have already been determined to be better suited for multiple-use management.
 - Ninety percent of the lands under lease have already been released from wilderness review and are available for mineral development.

o Outer Continental Shelf Development:

- My new five-year leasing program offers more acreage (45 million acres) than all acreage offered since the program began in 1954.
- Although only 2% or 3% of the total Outer Continental Shelf area has been leased, only a very small part of the OCS has any oil and gas potential. The most promising OCS areas (Alaska, Santa Barbara Channel, Gulf of Mexico and parts of the Atlantic) have been leased already or are scheduled for leasing.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o Governor Reagan says that he would accelerate the leasing of Federal lands. But he has no plan proposed to do that. And he has made no provision for environmental protection.

B. Carter

- o I will continue to develop all Federal mineral resources as rapidly as possible, consistent with our environmental requirements.

ENERGY: SOLAR GOAL

Question: Isn't your goal of 20% solar and renewable energy by the year 2000 an unrealistic one?

Answer:

THEME

AS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT OF MY COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY POLICY, I ESTABLISHED A NATIONAL GOAL OF SUPPLYING 20% OF OUR ENERGY NEEDS FROM SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES BY THE YEAR 2000. THIS IS AN AMBITIOUS TARGET WHICH WILL REQUIRE THE ACTIVE EFFORTS OF BOTH THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR, BUT I REMAIN COMMITTED TO MEETING IT.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

There was practically no solar or gasahol program when I took office.

- o I have more than tripled the Federal budget for solar and renewable resources to more than \$1.5 billion for fiscal year '81. This includes substantial investments in research and development in commercialization.
- o I have proposed and enacted the first tax credits to encourage the use of solar technologies in residential and commercial buildings, including the 40% credit passed this year.
- o Those policies are working. Ten times as many households have solar technology in place today as when I took office.
- o The Conservation and Solar Energy Development Bank that I proposed will provide a total of \$7.5 billion (1980-90) to spur conservation and solar energy investment.
- o We have quadrupled gasahol capacity over the last 24 months.
- o But Federal efforts alone cannot meet the ambitious 20% solar goal. The private sector must also commit its resources to pursuing these important energy resources.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o I regret Governor Reagan has never shown much interest in solar and renewable energy sources. He has offered no concrete development proposals for these alternative resources. The Republican Platform calls only for continued government support for research.

B. Carter

- o I will continue to strengthen programs now in place to encourage the increased use of solar and renewable resources to ensure that the Federal Government is doing everything it can to meet the 20% goal.
- o I will also push for new programs to encourage such use if they are needed. For example, I will continue to seek a tax credit for passive solar technologies.

Energy: Synfuels

Question: How can you justify spending \$68 billion to produce a few synthetic fuels?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE PUT OUR FIRST ENERGY PROGRAM IN PLACE. GOVERNOR REAGAN HAS NO REAL PROGRAM. THE SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION IS CHARGED WITH DEVELOPING THE SYNTHETIC FUELS INDUSTRY TO PRODUCE AT LEAST 2 MILLION BARRELS OF OIL EQUIVALENT BY 1992. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL NOT ACTUALLY PRODUCE ANY OF THESE FUELS ITSELF; WE WILL ACT INSTEAD AS A CATALYST FOR THE TALENTS AND INVENTIVENESS OF AMERICAN PRIVATE INDUSTRY, ABSORBING SOME OF THE SPECIAL RISKS OF THESE NEW TECHNOLOGIES IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THEIR DEVELOPMENT. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL NOT SPEND THIS MUCH. THE FEDERAL INVESTMENT IS LIMITED TO STANDING LOAN AND PRICE GUARANTEES.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o Synthetic fuels will play an important role in freeing our Nation from its dangerous dependence on imported oil. We need to have them available on a commercial scale as soon as possible. The private sector will develop and produce these fuels, but because of the high business risk inherent in these new technologies, they cannot move as rapidly as we need.
- o I established the Synthetic Fuels Corporation to serve as a catalyst for the private development of synthetic fuels. The Synthetic Fuels Corporation will provide loan guarantees and price or purchase guarantees to selected synfuels projects in order to decrease the risk to the companies that build them. This partnership of public and private capital will bring us a commercial-scale synthetic fuels industry much more rapidly than could the private sector alone.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

I think Governor Reagan's stand on synthetic fuel is very short-sighted. Governor Reagan would "turn the oil companies loose" to develop synthetic fuels, if they felt like doing so. He would abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and end all government investment in synfuels. This would be a tragedy for our energy future.

B. Carter

I will continue to provide risk-minimizing financial support for synfuels projects in order to meet our goal of 2 million barrels/ equivalent per day of synthetic fuels by 1992.

The steps I am taking will provide a secure future for our country.

ENERGY: WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

Question: Wouldn't we produce more oil if we limited or repealed the Windfall Profits Tax? Why do you oppose that?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE PUT OUR FIRST ENERGY PROGRAM IN PLACE. GOVERNOR REAGAN HAS NO REAL PROGRAM EXCEPT TO TURN THE OIL COMPANIES "LOOSE". I AM PROUD THAT WE SUCCEEDED IN ENACTING THE WINDFALL PROFITS TAX TO ENSURE THAT THE OIL COMPANIES DID NOT PROFIT EXCESSIVELY FROM THE DECONTROL OF CRUDE OIL AND TO FUND OUR VITAL NATURAL ENERGY POLICIES. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO EVIDENCE THAT THE EXISTENCE OF THIS TAX IS CONSTRAINING THE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF OIL.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o I decided to decontrol domestic crude oil in order to increase domestic oil production. We simply could not continue discouraging the development of American oil resources while we subsidized the increasing imports of foreign oil.
- o But rather than let all of the increased profits go to the oil companies, we enacted the Windfall Profits Tax. This tax will bring in over \$227 billion in 1980-90 to finance the development of alternative energy sources, triple our investment in mass transit and assist low-income households in meeting rising energy costs. The oil companies still keep 29¢ of every \$1 of income from decontrol after all taxes are paid -- a handsome return.
- o There is absolutely no evidence that the Windfall Profits Tax has held down domestic crude oil production. The number of operating oil and gas rigs reached an all-time high this month (3,164) and there are more new wells being drilled this year than any year in history. The real constraint on production today is the availability of drilling rigs.
- o Where specialized, marginal domestic production was more likely to be discouraged by high taxes (tertiary, newly discovered and heavy oil), the tax is applied at a very low rate.
- o We are continuing to make adjustments for unintended inequities in the Windfall Profits Tax. For example, we will support a \$1,000 tax credit for small royalty owners.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

Governor Reagan supports immediate, total crude oil decontrol and the repeal or weakening of the Windfall Profits Tax. This would drain the purchasing power of consumers through high prices, award massive profits to the oil companies and do nothing to help low-income families cope with the rising cost of energy or provide the revenues for an alternative energy program for mass transit.

B. Carter

I will continue to invest the revenues from the Windfall Profits Tax in securing our Nation's energy independence for mass transit and in aiding our poorest citizens. This will provide us with energy security.

JUN 1983

OVERVIEW
COPY
JUN 21 1968

ANDERSON

Question: How do you think Congressman Anderson will affect the election?
Do you think he has damaged the two party system?

Answer:

- o Congressman Anderson will definitely have some effect on the election; precisely how much I do not know. But, based on all of the data I have seen, there really is no doubt that his votes are being drawn disproportionately from me, rather than Governor Reagan.
- o That is so because many Independents and Democrats have felt that Congressman Anderson, because of some very recent changes in position, represented a more liberal approach to governmental matters than I do. And those Independents and Democrats make up the bulk of the Congressman's constituency.
- o I harbor no ill-feelings to John Anderson. He is a determined campaigner, and a good man. I think it is clear his positions are infinitely closer to mine than to Mr. Reagan's. Indeed, his positions on some issues are virtually indistinguishable from mine. But I do not think it is healthy for the two party system to have candidates defeated in the primary and caucus process become candidates in the general election. The stability of the two party system is one of our government's greatest virtues and should be preserved.
- o I do not know what the future impact of the Anderson candidacy will be on the two party system. My hope is that it will be preserved as we have known it.

DEATH PENALTY

Question: What is your position on the death penalty?

Answer:

- o As President, I am sworn to uphold the Constitution, and the Supreme Court has determined that, in the appropriate circumstances, the death penalty is constitutional.
- o The issue, therefore is not whether we can constitutionally employ the death penalty. The issue is determining what offenses, if any, warrant the death penalty.
- o This is principally a matter for the State legislatures to determine. My personal view, which I expressed in my last campaign, is that there are a very limited number of circumstances where the death penalty might be appropriate — such as the murder by an inmate of a prison guard. That remains my position today.

FEAR OF REAGAN

Question: Do you believe the Democratic constituencies will now be rallying around your candidacy for any reason other than fear of your Republican opponent? Isn't that fear becoming the critical element of your campaign, pushing you to run an essentially negative campaign?

Answer:

THEME

I AM A MAINSTREAM DEMOCRAT IN THE TRADITION OF ROOSEVELT, TRUMAN, KENNEDY, AND JOHNSON. MY OPPONENT IS A VERY CONSERVATIVE REPUBLICAN. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE INCREASINGLY RECOGNIZING THIS FACT AND I BELIEVE THEY ARE INCREASINGLY SUPPORTING ME BECAUSE OF THE FUTURE THAT I AM COMMITTED TO PROVIDING THE NATION.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o Over the past 4 years I have developed a record in the tradition of Democratic Presidents — commitment to peace, to creating new jobs, to helping the elderly, to protecting the poor and disadvantaged, to ensuring equal rights, to helping working men and women.
- o Like my Democratic predecessors, I have not been able to accomplish everything I wanted. And I have learned, from the experience of being President, how difficult it is to accomplish all that I would like.
- o But I believe the Democratic constituency is increasingly recognizing what we have accomplished and it is now rallying around the Democratic nominee for the same positive reasons that they have behind every Democratic nominee.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o I cannot deny that some Democratic voters are very concerned about Governor Reagan's positions and the direction in which he would like to take the country.
- o They are concerned about his opposition to SALT II, to ERA, to National Health Insurance, to the Windfall Profits Tax, to urban aid programs, to the Department of Education, to labor law reform, to Humphrey-Hawkins, to the minimum wage -- all of these programs are part of the Democratic Platform and my own agenda.

B. Carter

- o I am not trying to emphasize Governor Reagan's positions to the exclusion of my own, or my record.
- o I have always tried to give my audiences a clear picture of the contrasts between the two very different futures the country faces if Governor Reagan or I am elected. In doing that I emphasize what I am for and my opponent is against.

-- SALT II

-- Reduced Nuclear Arms Race

-- ERA

-- National Health Insurance

-- A strong Minimum Wage

-- Economic Revitalization -- particularly of the auto and steel industries

-- Continuation of Camp David process

-- Continued Normalization of Relations with China

FLIP-FLOPS

Question:

You have accused Governor Reagan of flip-flopping during the course of the campaign. Haven't you flip-flopped a great deal over the past four years? What is the difference?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE LEARNED FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF BEING PRESIDENT, AND I HAVE CHANGED SOME THINGS I DID EARLIER IN MY TERM. BUT THOSE CHANGES WERE MADE OVER TIME, AS THE PROCESS OF GOVERNING WENT FORWARD. GOVERNOR REAGAN HAS CHANGED HIS POSITIONS DURING THIS CAMPAIGN ON A VARIETY OF POSITIONS HE HAS TAKEN OVER A 20-YEAR PERIOD.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o As President, I have learned a great deal. Some of what I have learned has caused me to modify positions I had or approaches I took early in the term. For instance, I have adopted now a tougher anti-inflation program than I thought was necessary in the beginning. I decided to decontrol oil because of the increased importance of reducing our dependence on foreign energy. And I accelerated considerably our defense spending program because of the state I found our armed forces.
- o But all of this was done after a clear examination of the facts, and a careful, deliberate weighing of all the alternatives. In nearly every case, the change was not likely to increase my political standing and in fact none of them did.

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o By contrast, Governor Reagan has dropped, virtually overnight, positions he has held for nearly 20 years during an election campaign.
- o Let me give some examples:
 - Aid to New York City
 - Aid to Chrysler
 - Two China Policy
 - Minimum Wage
 - OSHA Abolition
- o I think the American people should be concerned about whether these new-found positions are the ones they would see implemented if Governor Reagan were elected, as opposed to the positions he has held for nearly 20 years.

B. Carter

- o I do not want to claim that I will never again change a position. I expect that I probably will at some point in a second term, as I learn more or circumstances change.
- o But I can say that my basic philosophy will never change:
 - passion for peace
 - overriding commitment to nuclear arms reduction
 - concern for the disadvantaged
 - commitment to help the working man and woman
 - dedication to equal rights and justice

GUN CONTROL

Question: Do you support greater gun control? If so, why have you not done more to achieve this?

Answer:

- o I support increased handgun controls. I support eliminating Saturday Night Specials -- which are so frequently used in violent crimes -- and I support improved registration requirements for handgun purchases. I do not believe, for instance, that any individual -- regardless of previous handgun or other criminal offenses -- should be allowed to purchase handguns. Strengthened registration requirements can help to prevent this.
- o I would not support any type of increased controls over long-guns. They are used for hunting and are not for criminal purposes. As a hunter, I know the value and importance of allowing long-guns to be purchased without Federal restraints.
- o This position is the one I outlined in my 1976 campaign. It is the position of our current Democratic Platform. It remains my position.
- o I regret that progress in this direction has not been achieved, but the lobbying pressure on Congress on this issue has been so intense that no action has been possible. In fact, the only action that we were able to initiate -- administrative tightening of some handgun registration requirements -- was effectively overturned by Congress.
- o I think the position advocated by Governor Reagan is dangerous, particularly for those who live in high-crime areas. The Governor believes that there should effectively be no restrictions on gun purchases. He supports the Republican Platform's call for repeal of the Gun Control Act of 1968, which was passed after Robert Kennedy was killed.
- o In my view, a position which does not regulate Saturday Night Specials or handguns is not one which recognizes reality. The ready availability of those guns to those who might not otherwise so easily obtain them is not a sound way to protect innocent people.

INTEGRITY

Question: In light of the Bert Lance and Billy Carter affairs, how can you honestly claim to have restored integrity to the White House?

Answer:

THEME

I HAVE WORKED LONG AND HARD TO OVERCOME THE STAIN OF WATERGATE AND ITS AFTERMATH AND OUR RECORD INDICATES WE HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL. I INTEND TO CONTINUE OUR STRONG, FORTHRIGHT RECORD IN THIS AREA DURING A SECOND TERM.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o When I took office, the Presidency was suffering from the problems associated with the Vietnam War, Watergate, the CIA revelations. There was a sense of distrust of the Presidency. There was a decline in respect of the Presidency. There was an abhorrence of the secrecy and heavy-handedness that surrounded the Oval Office.
- o We have changed that. We have worked to restore integrity, through legislation now requiring full financial disclosure of Federal officials, the appointment of Special Prosecutors in appropriate cases, the end of the "revolving-door" syndrome in Washington.
- o We have put Inspectors General in each of the Departments to root out fraud and waste.
- o We have established an independent Justice Department -- one with virtually no contact with the White House.
- o We have established blue ribbon Commissions to take politics out of judicial appointments.
- o We have been open -- held 30 Town Hall Meetings (no other President has ever done so), 60 press conferences; we have provided greater access to the White House and Cabinet Departments for all citizens than ever before.
- o When there have been problems - as with Billy Carter - I have been honest and aboveboard about the situation.

2. THE FUTURE

Carter

- o I am committed in the future to taking further steps to ensure the integrity and openness of our government -- that is among my highest priorities.

o I am committed to:

- continued appointment of qualified, honest individuals to key Federal positions;
- passage of lobby law reform -- to provide the public with greater information about lobbying activities;
- preserving sunshine rules and requirements; and
- continuing an independent Justice Department.

JUN 27 1983

QUOTES OF REAGAN

Question: Do you think it is fair to repeat old quotes of Governor Reagan's - many of the quotes are from the 1960's - when he has changed his positions since these quotes were made? Aren't you taking them out of context as well?

Answer:

- o On a few occasions early in the campaign I was justly criticized for trying to characterize Governor Reagan's positions. So I decided to avoid that problem by simply quoting Governor Reagan. That way there could be no basis for complaints of mischaracterization.
- o When I do quote him, I try to indicate the date, so the audience can judge for itself the timeliness of the Governor's statements.
- o But generally, I have been quoting Governor Reagan's most current quotes, because they best represent his latest views and because some of them trouble me the most.
- o For instance, it was this year - 1980 - that Governor Reagan has said:
 - "High unemployment is in large part due to the minimum wage."
 - "The minimum wage has caused more misery and unemployment than anything since the Great Depression."
 - "Urban aid programs are one of the biggest phonies in the system."
 - "I don't think nuclear non-proliferation is any of our business."
 - "Air pollution is substantially under control."
 - " % of pollution comes from trees."
 - "We should use the nuclear arms race card."
- o These positions show a lack of understanding of the complexities our Nation faces and that a President faces.
 - The minimum wage has helped millions of Americans and I am wholeheartedly committed to it.
 - Urban aid programs have revitalized our urban areas and helped our most disadvantaged citizens, and I am committed to their growth.

- Nuclear non-proliferation is our business - it is vital to all of us.
- Air pollution is not under control, though progress has been made; but we must remain vigilant in this area. And it doesn't come from trees.
- And a nuclear arms race is a reckless proposal.

GOVERNMENT

SEP 27 1983

RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Question: Why have you had so much difficulty in dealing with Congress and in getting your major programs adopted in the form you propose? Why would you be any more successful during a second term?

Answer:

THEME

MY RECORD WITH THE CONGRESS HAS BEEN GOOD. A SUBSTANTIAL MAJORITY OF MY MAJOR PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN ENACTED. GOVERNOR REAGAN WOULD NOT DO NEARLY AS WELL - AS A REPUBLICAN AND A NEWCOMER. MY EXPERIENCE SHOULD MAKE THE NEXT FOUR YEARS EVEN BETTER.

1. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

- o No President has ever had a Congress approve every item of his legislative program - that would make Congress a rubber-stamp, and that is not what the Founding Fathers intended and that would not be healthy.
- o There certainly have been tough legislative fights - and they have received a good deal of publicity - but the bitter feelings and all-out war between Congress and the President which existed during the Nixon-Ford years has never occurred.
- o We have probably not done a good enough job letting the public know how successful we have been with Congress. A look at the record of what has been passed during the past four years shows how much progress and cooperation there has been. In fact, a substantial majority of my major legislative programs have been enacted - and that is a record which about equals my Democratic predecessors:
 - Energy program - there was none
 - Urban policy - there was none
 - Civil Service Reform
 - Deregulation of airlines, trucks, rail, and banks
 - Saving of Social Security System
 - Humphrey-Hawkins
 - Minimum Wage Increases
 - Department of Education
 - ERA deadline extension
 - Increased Defense Spending
 - Taiwan-U.S. Relations Act

2. THE FUTURE

A. Reagan

- o I do not believe Governor Reagan would be able to improve that record.

- o As a Republican, he will be dealing with a Democratic Congress - producing the type of stalemate and confrontation we saw in the Nixon-Ford years.
- o As a newcomer to Washington, Governor Reagan would have to go through the same long trial and error period that I did - and as a Republican that period would be even more difficult.
- o There are so many pressing problems now before the Congress that we cannot afford a 1-2 year hiatus.

B. Carter

- o I have not been able to pass all that I proposed, but I am going to keep pursuing my legislative agenda - as I did with my energy program - until we are successful. I now know the Congress and the key people in it.
- o I have a clear legislative program for the future:
 - SALT II
 - National Health Insurance
 - Economic Renewal Package
 - Welfare Reform
 - Job Creation Programs
 - The last pieces of our energy program (Utility Oil Backout, EMB)
- o Progress toward enacting these measures has been made. The foundation has been laid. I have the experience and know-how to get them enacted, without undue delays and interruption. I am determined to do that.